DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 983 RC 014 429

AUTHOR Hagood, Richard A.
TITLE Partnership for Rural Improvement: New Dimensions. Annual Report 1980-1981.
INSTITUTION Partnership for Rural Improvement, Pullman, Wash.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE Jul 81
NOTE 56p.; For related documents, see ED 142 358, ED 162 787, ED 209 036, ED 214 729, ED 219 197 and RC 014 430-431.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; *Community Education; Community Services; Coordination; Demonstration Programs; Economic Climate; *Fellowships; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Linking Agents; Models; Organizational Development; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Public Agencies; Rural Areas; Rural Population; Training
IDENTIFIERS *Partnership for Rural Improvement; *Task Force Approach; Walla Walla Community College WA; Washington

ABSTRACT

In 1980-1981, extended funding from the Kellogg Foundation and a total budget of $561,316 allowed the Partnership for Rural Improvement (PRI) to add to its program while continuing to emphasize project development, organizational development, interorganizational coordination, and training and education. PRI began to use task forces as a method of organizing educators, public officials, and citizens into teams to address issues of region-wide concern. They also awarded seven community service fellowships to encourage university, community college, or other agency personnel to give intensive short-term input into task force projects. PRI established a community action demonstration program in the Moses Lake School District as a means of increasing the capacity of rural communities to solve problems and realize opportunities through a coordinated system of community education. To test the transferability of PRI into another setting and to develop an appropriate model diffusion strategy, the PRI model was transferred into the Walla Walla Community College District. Finally PRI used two student interns in an effort to prepare a broader range of professionals who can contribute to rural improvement. In 1981-1982, PRI expected to refine and expand its new areas of concentration and to focus on necessary new management practices. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

rec'd 11-21-83

ED235983

PARTNERSHIP FOR RURAL IMPROVEMENT: NEW DIMENSIONS

ANNUAL REPORT
1980-1981

W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION
Battle Creek, Michigan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WILLIAM H. GRAY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by

Richard A. Hagood, Program Administrator

July, 1981

Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

RC014429

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PROGRESS REPORT--CONTINUING EMPHASES 4

III. PROGRESS REPORT--NEW DIMENSIONS 20

IV. PLANS FOR 1981-1982 34

V. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET 39

PREFACE

The Partnership for Rural Improvement is pleased to submit this, the fifth, annual report to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. It is also a report to the participating public service organizations and to rural residents of Washington who have received PRI services. The success of PRI is genuinely the result of the commitment of the partner organizations to work cooperatively in the delivery of their services to the residents of the PRI fifteen-county region. Credit belongs to them. The program is an association of public agencies, educational institutions, local jurisdictions and rural citizens that choose to work together to improve the quality of rural life. It is only as PRI is successful in building and maintaining productive relationships among its partners that it will survive.

Without assistance from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation PRI would not have been formed. PRI was organized in 1976 with an initial grant from the Foundation of $947,580. An extension of the original four year grant was received in 1980 to enable PRI to meet new opportunities brought on by the success of the program during its first four years. The three-year extension is scheduled to end in 1983. The resources of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation provided the seed money necessary for the partner organizations to risk the formation of the Partnership for Rural Improvement.

Many people have contributed to the preparation of this report. Special thanks to Ralph Loomis, Mike Schwalbe, Rob McDaniel, and Mary Reed for preparing material from which much of the report is taken. PRI

is fortunate to have excellent professionals serving as staff. This report is a direct result of their efforts during the year to operationalize the goals of PRI. A listing of individuals who have had formal association with PRI during the past year is included on the pages prefacing the report.

Richard A. Hagood
Program Administrator
Partnership for Rural Improvement

PARTNERSHIP FOR RURAL IMPROVEMENT

Organizational Roster *

REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Donn Adams, Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla

Julian Agranoff, Grant-Lincoln-Adams Conference of Governments, Ephrata

Jim Barron, Washington State University, Pullman

Jim Beard, Walla Walla County Regional Planning, Walla Walla

Connie Clark, Okanogan County Community Action, Okanogan

P. J. DeBenedetti, Moses Lake School District #161, Moses Lake

Bill Hoekendorf, Eastern Washington University, Cheney

Fred Huston, Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake

Joyce Owens, Chelan County Cooperative Extension, Wenatchee

Gene Rieger, Washington State Community College District 17, Spokane

LeRoy Rogers, Washington State University, Pullman

Mary Selecky, Tri-County Health District, Colville

Rev. Ed Silrum, Clarkston

Winifred Voelckers, Wenatchee Valley College-North, Omak

Bob Wilson, Northport City Council, Northport

Neil Zimmerman, Eastern Washington University, Cheney

CENTRAL SUB-REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Rolando Adame, Northwest Rural Opportunities, Moses Lake

Julian Agranoff, Grant-Lincoln-Adams Conference of Governments, Ephrata

* There are many people who have worked within the PRI framework. This list includes those people who have been identified with the formal organizational structure of PRI.

Larry Angell, City of Moses Lake Planning Department, Moses Lake

Noel Brown, Consultant, Moses Lake

Bruce Davis, Adams County Cooperative Extension, Ritzville

P. J. DeBenedetti, Moses Lake Community Schools, Moses Lake

Mary Eckes, Othello Community Schools, Othello

Ray Faini, Grant County Cooperative Extension, Ephrata

Ernest Forge, Education Service District #171, Wenatchee

Bill Frederickson, Grant County Commissioner, Ephrata

Dave Hiklan, Grant County Community Action, Moses Lake

Sam Hunter, Grand Coulee

Fred Huston, Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake

Red Kafer, Education Service District #171, Wenatchee

Michael Lang, Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake

Randy Martin, Adams County Planning Department, Othello

Doug Miller, Ephrata

Lee Perdue, City of Royal City, Royal City

Orissa Schultz, Quincy

Diana Slate, Moses Lake Community Schools, Moses Lake

Brenda Teals, Columbia Basin Allied Arts, Moses Lake

Bill Thompson, Grant County Family Planning, Ephrata

Ken Waud, Grant County Cooperative Extension, Ephrata

Gene Yzaguirre, Northwest Rural Opportunities, Moses Lake

EASTERN SUB-REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Dick Bloom, Education Service District #101, Spokane

Marie J. Bremner, Ferry County Cooperative Extension, Republic

Abby Byrne, Grant-Lincoln-Adams Council of Governments, Davenport

Margaret Clow, Whitman County Rural Library, Colfax

Kenneth I. Gross, Spokane County Cooperative Extension, Spokane

Carolyn J. Hyde, Almira City Council, Almira

Bruce Pennell, Northeast Washington Rural Resources, Chewelah

Gene Rieger, Washington State Community College District 17, Spokane

Mary Selecky, Tri-County Health District, Colville

Bob Wilson, Northport City Council, Northport

SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON RURAL PARTNERSHIP

Donn Adams, Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla

Jim Beard, Walla Walla County Regional Planning, Walla Walla

Andy Bull, Blue Mountain Action Council, Lewiston, ID

Anne Haley, Walla Walla Public Library, Walla Walla

Rose Harris, Waitsburg

Bob Howser, Walla Walla Community College, Clarkston

Frank H. Johnson, Asotin

Gene Kelly, Walla Walla County Commissioner, Walla Walla

Joan Lundgreen, Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla

Nancy MacDuff, Camp Fire, Walla Walla

Bernard P. McCabe, Asotin County Commissioner, Clarkston

Dorothy Mead, Dayton

Gary Neal, Clarkston

Stan Paul, Clarkston

Tom Roe, Walla Walla Mental Health Center, Walla Walla

Rev. Ed Silrum, Clarkston

Les Smith, Prescott Lions, Prescott

John Thrasher, Walla Walla County Superintendent of Schools, Walla Walla

Howard Willson, Walla Walla County Cooperative Extension, Walla Walla

Virginia Woods, Asotin County Cooperative Extension, Asotin

WESTERN SUB-REGIONAL COMMITTEE

Leath Andrews, Okanogan County Cooperative Extension, Okanogan

Dick Bartram, Chelan County Cooperative Extension, Wenatchee

Hazel Burnett, Okanogan Community Action, Okanogan

Mary Cooper, Brewster

Marlene Curtis, Community Resource Center, Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee

Ernie Forge, Educational Service District #171, Wenatchee

Bob Johnson, Douglas County Cooperative Extension, Waterville

Jim King, Okanogan County Planning Office, Okanogan

Ed Loidhammer, Chelan County Regional Planning, Wenatchee

Mike Lynch, North Central Regional Library, Wenatchee

Bob Patrick, Douglas County Planning Department, East Wenatchee

George Sangster, Upper Columbia Economic Development District, Chelan

Bob Soule, Community Action, Wenatchee

Nancy Stetson, Wenatchee, Valley College, Wenatchee

Bill Tarver, Community Action, Wenatchee

Wini Voelckers, Wenatchee Valley College-North, Omak

Dan Walters, North Central Regional Library, Wenatchee

PRI STAFF AND AFFILIATED COLLEAGUES

Donna Brians, Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla

Ellen Dunbar, Eastern Washington University, Cheney

Walt Gmelch, Washington State University, Pullman

William Goetter, Eastern Washington University, Pullman

Robert Grunewald, Washington State University, Pullman

Richard Hagood, Washington State University, Pullman

B. Ray Horn, Eastern Washington University, Cheney

Sherry Krueger, Knolls Vista Elementary School, Moses Lake

William Lassey, Washington State University, Pullman

Ralph Loomis, Washington State University, Pullman

Nicholas Lovrich, Washington State University, Pullman

Vicki Braglio-Luther, Washington State Community College District 17, Spokane

Robert McDaniel, Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake

C. Gordon Morris, Washington State University, Pullman

Carol Oakes, Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee

Dwight Pace, Washington State University, Pullman

Mary Reed, Washington State University, Pullman

Corinne Rowe, Washington State University, Pullman

Joseph Roy, Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee

Michael Schwalbe, Washington State University, Pullman

James Shoemaker, Washington State University, Pullman

John Wardwell, Washington State University, Pullman

William Willard, Washington State University, Pullman

WSU ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

George B. Brain, College of Education, Washington State University

Carl W. Hall, College of Engineering, Washington State University

Thomas L. Kennedy, College of Sciences & Arts, Washington State University

Robert Nilan, Division of Sciences, Washington State University

Carl J. Nyman, The Graduate School, Wasington State University

John S. Robins, College of Agriculture, Washington State University

J. Orville Young, Cooperative Extension, Washington State University

WSU ADVISORY COUNCIL

Dale G. Andersen, Department of Education, Washington State University

Jim Barron, CRD, Cooperative Extension, Washington State University

John M. Cronland, Office of Continuing University Studies, Washington State University

Don A. Dillman, Department of Rural Sociology, Washington State University

Lee Freese, Department of Sociology, Washington State University

William Funk, Environmental Science, Washington State University

Gene Hansen, Small Business Development Center, Washington State University

Robert J. Harder, College of Sciences & Arts, Washington State University

John Pierce, Department of Political Science, Washington State University

LeRoy F. Rogers, Department of Agricultural Economics, Washington State University

I. INTRODUCTION: NEW DIMENSIONS

The Partnership for Rural Improvement added several new dimensions during 1980-1981 which built upon the goals established at the outset of the program to expand PRI's range of activity. When PRI was formed in 1976, the goals were organized in four broad categories:

1. to strengthen the capacity of elected and appointed public officials and other interested citizens to accomplish community problem-solving,

2. to increase the effectiveness of educational institutions and public service agencies in contributing to the solution of community problems,

3. to develop and evaluate approaches to providing communication and organizational linkages among educational institutions, public service agencies, and local communities; to improve existing linkages and organize new linkages where effective collaboration did not exist,

4. to prepare educational and training materials which contribute to the realization of other PRI objectives.

Today, these basic goals remain the foundation upon which all PRI is based, however, several new dimensions have been added for the period of 1980-1983. The three-year grant extension received from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has made it possible for PRI to take advantage of several opportunities that have come to the program.

The new dimensions added to the Partnership for Rural Improvement will be a major focus of this year's report in order to account for the additional investment in PRI made by the Foundation. Therefore, in addition to a progress report on the continuing objectives of PRI, the report will describe progress made in the areas of new emphasis:

1. use of task forces as a method of organizing educators, public officials, and citizens into teams to address issues of a region-wide concern,

2. awarding of community service fellowships to encourage university, community college or other agency personnel to give intensive,

short-term input into the task force projects,

3. establishment of a community education demonstration program as a means to increase the capacity of rural communities to solve problems and realize opportunities through a coordinated system of community education,

4. diffusion of the PRI model into the Walla Walla Community College District to test the transferability of PRI into another geographical setting,

5. expanded use of student internships to prepare a broader range of professionals who can contribute to rural improvement.

The year 1980-1981 was one of added funding and new program emphases. It was also a year of renewed commitment to community service by several partners who faced severe financial challenges. The withdrawal of federal and state funds from several partner programs threatened to restrict PRI participation. The demise of funding for certain community action, economic development, and growth impact programs forced adjustments in partner strategies, but throughout these traumas the commitment to the purposes of PRI remained unbroken.

Local jurisdictions were forced by the economic crunch to make tough decisions reducing or eliminating worthwhile community services. Educational institutions were not immune. Adjustments had to be made at each of the region's public higher education institutions to cope with fewer resources. In some cases positions were left unfilled; in others, faculty were laid off and summer sessions ended. Yet in the face of these challenges PRI has been maintained as a viable priority at each of the institutions. Direct financial support was increased at Eastern Washington University, Washington State University, Washington State Community College District 17, and Wenatchee Valley College. These are all very positive signs of PRI support.

This report is written at a time when partner and staff confidence in the future of the Partnership for Rural Improvement is high. From the PRI

perspective, the conservative mood in the nation is seen as timely for the PRI emphasis on community and individual self-help. The increasing need for generalists to balance the trend to excessive specialization within disciplines is being met in a small way by the community leadership development focus. The use of dewindling resources in a coordinated, cost-effective fashion is central to the PRI mission. PRI may well be at the best of times for the wide application of the model that has been developed during the past five years.

II. PROGRESS REPORT - CONTINUING EMPHASES

The continuing emphases of PRI can be grouped into four program areas: project development, organizational development, interorganizational coordination, and training and education. These categories have become the main organizers for planning and evaluating PRI activity during the five years of the partnership.

During the course of the past year, the Partnership for Rural Improvement was involved in over 80 projects the bulk of which were in the area of project development. Most of the projects could appropriately be placed in any of the four program areas, but for merely administrative convenience they are placed in a category where it is judged their primary benefit lies. Records are kept on each of the PRI projects. What will be included in this report are illustrative activities which give an indication of the scope of PRI effort.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

PRI has maintained its excellent record in strengthening the capacity of elected and appointed public officials and interested citizens to solve community problems they identify. The following projects illustrate this activity.

Lincoln County Growth Impact

Public officials in six eastern Washington counties are planning for a large influx of construction workers and permanent employees in the area by 1983. According to state agency sources, peak employment figures on two major projects could total 4050. Estimates are that the Mt. Tolman copper molybdenum

project on the Colville reservation could employ as many as 1550 workers in 1982. Permanent employment is expected to be between 500 and 600. The Washington Water Power project at Creston will employ perhaps 2500 construction personnel in 1986. The number of permanent employees to operate the anticipated four units of the coal-fired generating facility is projected to be 375. There are at least ten other energy-related projects proposed for the area by the mid-1990's.

PRI is currently assisting Lincoln County Cooperative Extension and the Grant-Lincoln-Adams Conference of Governments to help local communities assess the potential impact of the anticipated population influx and plan accordingly. The influx of people during the construction phase is projected to severely strain the budgets of the communities of Almira, Creston, Davenport and Wilbur, as well as Lincoln County, as they attempt to provide public services. PRI assisted with a four-session Fiscal Management Workshop designed to help the communities (1) project the population influx to be expected; (2) extrapolate future public service expenses; (3) project future revenue levels for the communities; and (4) develop means and policy decisions to meet any revenue short-falls.

The workshops were highly rated by the participants and were successful in bringing together as resource people staff from several public service agencies. There has been considerable follow-up to the workshop during which PRI helped with town meetings and advised public officials on next steps. The workshop dove-tailed nicely with the efforts of the Grant-Lincoln-Adams Conference of Government to assist these same communities develop comprehensive plans and other mechanisms to prepare for growth. The staff of PRI was very active in support of the COG staff.

Plans for 1981-1982 call for the formation of a Lincoln County Area Development Team, representing partners in the area, to continue providing educational and planning services to the impacted communities.

Peshastin Community Council

Small rural communities often choose to forego formal government and remain unincorporated. Unfortunately, problems also often arise which require some form of coordinated community action. The community of Peshastin in Chelan County has developed an alternate form of organization to deal with several pressing community issues, while remaining unincorporated. The Partnership for Rural Improvement assisted the community to explore a variety of local government options which eventually led to the formation of the Peshastin Community Council.

Instead of establishing a formal governmental structure through incorporation, the Community Council serves as the official voice of the community both to the county and the state. In February 1981, an election was organized through which seven persons were selected to serve on the Council. Thus, in less than five months, Peshastin moved from little or no community organization to formation of an elected representative body. The Council is currently involved in three key issues: school consolidation, location of a senior citizens' center, and highway safety.

Staff from the Partnership for Rural Improvement was contacted in October 1980 to help organize a core group of interested local residents. From that point onward, PRI helped the residents develop strategies that culminated in the Council. It is anticipated that with this phase of organization complete further assistance and other forms of support can be provided as requested

to assure the official voice of the community speaks effectively. In the meantime several unincorporated communities are watching with interest the Peshastin experiment. It is possible that the community council model will be a popular alternative for small rural communities.

Interlake School

Early in 1981, staff members of the Partnership for Rural Improvement were asked by the administration of the Interlake School for the Severely Retarded for assistance in staff development. The request was for help in developing a more effective team functioning at the school. The assumption underlying the PRI intervention was that the improvement of staff functioning would increase the quality of problem-solving services available to the citizens of eastern Washington. Interlake School is located in Medical Lake, within the service area of PRI's Eastern Sub-Region.

The initial description of the situation stated that various team members were not functioning well because of lack of team skills. Upon further examination, a training team discovered that there were also conflicts among the aids, the occupational therapists, the special education teachers, and the administration. It was decided that an effort would be made to enhance the working environment and teach team building skills to all members of the staff.

The PRI staff members developed a format for several training strategies. Half-hour interviews were conducted with the Interlake personnel. Information gathered from these interviews was incorporated into needs and consequently training plans for the professional staff. During the months April and May, three workshops were held on organizational structure, communication skills, and leadership roles. Subsequent sessions have been held with the administrator of the school.

It is anticipated that there may be additional workshops in 1981-1982. The administration has asked PRI to be available to continue with the team-building efforts. The results will certainly facilitate an improved service delivery system to the citizens of eastern Washington.

Senior Nutrition Project

The Senior Nutrition Project of the Southeast Washington Senior Roundtable provides meals to senior citizens through six meal sites and home delivery in Walla Walla, Columbia, Garfield and Asotin counties. In fiscal year 1980, the project served 1,836 seniors by providing 71,391 meals. It is currently experiencing a 20 per cent increase in meals served. The Senior Nutrition Project is funded by the Area Agency on Aging and is governed by an advisory council with members from the four counties. Twelve meal site managers and cooks comprise the staff. The project depends on volunteers for home delivery and site meal services.

The PRI Community Service Consultant was asked by the director of the project to help the staff and advisory council improve their effectiveness; improve management capabilities, increase services to low and minority populations, and improve their ability to recruit and retain volunteers. An assessment of the group's needs resulted in PRI offering organizational development consultation and training sessions to improve staff competence and outreach efforts. The sessions were conducted by staff from PRI partners.

News of the proposed training sessions spread to other human services staff in the area. Twenty-five seniors program workers representing ten agencies and organizations participated. Among the organizations included were the Department of Social and Health Services, St. Mary Community Hospital,

Walla Walla Mental Health, and Senior Nutrition programs in Pasco and Richland. Evaluations of the completed sessions have been very positive.

Additional training sessions will occur in the fall of 1981 and the spring of 1982. Already the director of the Senior Nutrition Project has reported that the functioning of the advisory council has improved and staff competence increased.

Other representative projects sponsored by PRI during 1980-1981 can be listed by title to demonstrate the range of PRI activity:

- Grand Coulee Dam--planning management workshops
- Electric City Comprehensive Plan--citizen participation
- Reardon School District--consultation on district philosophy
- Washington State Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs--training and development of support services manual
- Glenrose Oral History--design of oral history project
- Northport Comprehensive Plan--town hall meetings and citizen participation
- Early Intervention and Screening for Handicapped Children--consultation on group formation and training
- Ritzville School Support Group--group organized to support quality of schooling
- Methow Valley Self-Help--human services program based on volunteer efforts
- KPBX-rural public service radio programming

The choice for PRI is always how to select from a number of very worthwhile projects those which are most appropriate to the PRI mission. The demand for PRI assistance is greater than that which can be responded to by PRI staff and partners.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Partnership for Rural Improvement has had a continuing impact on the organizations that deliver services to the rural communities of the fifteen-county region. The intent has been to increase the effectiveness of educational institutions and public service agencies in contributing to the solution of community problems. Often PRI assistance takes the form of advising on organizational change and of training administrators and staff on ways of increasing their organization's effectiveness. The following projects demonstrate PRI involvement in this program area during 1980-1981.

EWU Community Service Center

Eastern Washington University's Community Service Center, established with PRI assistance three years ago, has undergone a period of evaluation and change in an effort to increase its effectiveness in responding to community needs. Many of the changes were an attempt to manage better the use of faculty time assigned to PRI. A plan was developed by the Center director, and PRI staff member, to organize faculty input around a project-by-project management scheme whereby it would be possible to account for the time, materials and support services committed to various projects. Also initiated was a computer search program that keeps on file a listing of faculty expertise that can be attached with requests for services.

Wenatchee Valley College

The strong commitment of the President of Wenatchee Valley College to community service was further demonstrated during 1980-1981 with the centralization of all community services into one office which reports directly to

him. Included in the reorganization was the Community Resource Center, PRI, and the non-credit community education courses. The new Office of Community Programs will increase the effectiveness of the College's service to the community and increase PRI access to college resources. The director of the Office of Community Programs is an active PRI participant in the Western Sub-Region and serves on the Task Force Sub-Committee of the Regional Coordinating Committee.

Washington State University

As a result of the recommendations of the WSU Task Force on Continuing Education, chaired by the PRI Program Administrator, Washington State University used 1980-1981 to determine the most appropriate ways of implementing the Task Force report. The PRI Program Administrator was appointed by the administration on a half-time basis to assist the Provost's Office. Four committees functioned during the year on specific objectives raised by the Task Force. One committee focused on the creation of an office of conference planning; another on the general design of a continuing education facility; a third met to outline a program proposal on the theme of leadership and management development; and the fourth committee evaluated options for reorganizing the University's administrative and management structure for community services.

After numerous meetings with key administrative leaders, WSU has decided to create a position of assistant provost for university outreach to oversee the further implementation of the Task Force recommendations. The position is part of the University's commitment to the goals of PRI and is one of the four fte's obligated to support the program. One of the changes

proposed is to create a community service unit at WSU based on the staff and resources of PRI. This would accomplish the goal of institutionalizing the PRI model in the state's land grant institution.

PRI staff members were involved in several other organizational development efforts during 1980-1981. A brief listing by title demonstrates the nature of this involvement:

- Big Bend Community College--human services program
- Washington State Community College District 17 Women's Programs-consultation on service delivery
- Western Region Homemaker's Leadership Project--board training
- Planning Association of Washington--organizational goal setting
- Columbia Basin Health Association--board training
- Community Resource Center WVC--transition to local funding sources

PRI continues to receive numerous requests for training and organizational development consultation from groups outside of the project region as well as within the fifteen counties. Most of the requests could be labeled as leadership and management development. In the future, PRI will need to determine the extent to which it is able to respond to these types of requests.

INTERORGANIZATIONAL COORDINATION

The third major program area of the Partnership for Rural Improvement is identified as interorganizational coordination. The goal has been to increase the effectiveness of communication and organizational linkages among the agen-

cies and organizations associated with PRI. While there is an occasional intervention with non-partner agencies, the focus of activity in this area is building and maintaining the partnership itself. The following examples show the variety of PRI interorganizational coordination during 1980-1981.

Joint Support For Staff

The arrangements for funding the community service positions at the four community college partners have varied over the years as PRI has sought to put in place the most effective method of providing staff support to the sub-regional committees. For some time staff members were employed by both Washington State University and the host community college. This approach created confusion with regard to the accumulation of annual and sick leaves and some disadvantages to the employee. In 1980-1981 the decision was made to make the field staff people full time community college employees.

While at two community colleges funds for the staff position come from the grant, Wenatchee Valley College and Washington State Community College District 17 have entered into agreements with Cooperative Extension at Washington State University to jointly fund positions from institutional sources. The memoranda of agreement state that Cooperative Extension will reimburse each of the two community colleges for one-half of the salary and benefits of the community service consultants in an amount not to exceed $15,000. In turn the community college employs a full-time staff person. The agreements set out responsibilities for supervision. The PRI Program Administrator manages the contract and is the final person to whom the staff person reports.

Reference to the literature on interorganizational coordination, including the work of Loomis, Fernandez, and Spencer for PRI, verifies that the

joint staff arrangement now in place is a very high level of collaboration. (See Annual Report, 1977-1978). It is an excellent demonstration of the commitment that the administration of Cooperative Extension has to PRI and the trust that has been established via PRI with the community colleges.

Regional Coordinating Committee

The Regional Coordinating Committee has implemented a major adjustment in its membership during the year to involve more directly the sub-regional committees in the policy and advisory functions of the partnership. The group's membership was increased to sixteen with representation in the two categories of higher education institutions and sub-regional committees: Big Bend Community College, Eastern Washington University (2), Walla Walla Community College, Washington State Community College District 17, Washington State University (2), Wenatchee Valley College; and from the sub-regional committees; Central Sub-Region (2), Eastern Sub-Region (2), Southeastern Rural Partnership (2), and the Western Sub-Region (2). The sub-regional representation currently includes health services, planning departments, elected city officials, school districts, community action programs, clergy, and county Cooperative Extension.

It is believed that the reorganization has led to greater involvement by a wider spectrum of the partnership. Persons not directly involved at the program management or service levels are no longer sitting on the committee. The quality of Regional Coordinating Committee meetings has increased as has the sense of ownership of the program. There are several active sub-committees of the RCC now in operation. One sub-committee has responsibility for providing direction to the task force and community service fellowship programs.

Another is examining ways to improve the quality of communication linkages within the partnership.

This year the RCC sponsored PRI Forum focused on the task of strengthening the interorganizational bonds of PRI. For the first time since the formation of PRI, the Forum was not opened to the general public. Rather the PRI Forum was used to discuss the health and future of the Partnership for Rural Improvement. Reaction to the change has been uniformly positive. Involvement of the general public will occur at one-day conferences scheduled around the release of task force reports. Thus the public participation dimension of PRI will be strengthened by capitalizing on the issue-oriented interests of the public.

Sub-Regional Committees

Continuing dedication of the sub-regional committees to the search for effective working relationships among partner organizations has produced positive results during 1980-1981. The three sub-regional committees that have existed since 1976 have undergone a period of self-assessment during the year. The fourth committee, the newly formed Southeast Washington Rural Partnership, will be discussed later in this report.

The Central Sub-Regional Committee has witnessed a sizeable expansion in membership. Several organizations not previously associated with PRI have joined the group. The decision to expand was made after a careful analysis of the progress the Committee was making toward linking together the agencies and organizations concerned about the quality of rural life in Grant and Adams counties. Another factor in the increased number of partners has been the level of project activity. Several key projects have added to the sense of

ownership. Especially significant has been the work with the Lincoln County growth impact area and the Moses Lake Community Schools. Both projects have required the close cooperation and participation of several PRI partners.

The Eastern Sub-Regional Committee continues to be a stable group with very little turnover in membership. The Committee works effectively in its meetings in giving direction and support to the Community Service Consultant. The Committee has sponsored several projects which have drawn on partner resources over the year. Of special note has been the evaluation of committee effectiveness which the PRI staff person has undertaken with the assistance of outside process observers. Often PRI offers assistance to groups seeking counsel on their effectiveness. Not often enough does PRI apply the same review to its own operations.

Western Sub-Regional Committee members have been examining the distinctions between tasks designed to maintain PRI as an organization and those tasks in which PRI engages to enable partners to work together effectively. It is unwise to expect that all partners share equal concern over the work of the Regional Coordinating Committee, the sub-regional committee, or other sub-regions. Rather some partners wish to focus on joint tasks. Others are willing to deal with organizational maintainance issues. As understanding has grown among committee members that this is an acceptable policy, the sense of common purpose has increased. The role of the Community Service Consultant takes on increased importance as a coordinator of interorganizational relations outside the formal meeting structure.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Partnership for Rural Improvement was actively engaged in the process of conducting training events, presenting reports, and issuing publications

during 1980-1981. The intent has been to prepare educational and training materials which contribute to the realization of other PRI objectives. PRI views this goal to be an important dimension of the model-building efforts of the program. The report will highlight three major publications issued during the year.

The Price of Change

After a long wait, The Price of Change: A Growth Impact Assessment Guide was published in January, 1981. The guide is designed to respond to the need faced by local governments to identify the public costs exacted upon city and county in terms of budgets and quality of life considerations of development proposals. Equipped with this guide, local government can systematically assess the price change is going to cost and allocate costs equitably between the public and private sectors.

The project team was composed of faculty and staff members from Eastern Washington University and Washington State University. Project director was Dr. Joseph Luther of EWU's Department of Urban and Regional Planning. The review site for the project was Ferry County, Washington.

Railroad Abandonment

One of the results of the PRI-sponsored Citizen's Task Force on Railroad Abandonment was the publication in September, 1980 of the report Social Impact Assessment and Railroad Abandonment: Three Case Studies in Rural Eastern Washington. The study was of the impacts of the loss of rail service on rural communities in eastern Washington. It reflects the "growing concern among citizens and local public officials that the total impacts of an abandonment are not reflected in the purely economic assessments of the loss of rail service

completed to date." (Preface)

Twenty-four citizens participated in conducting the study and formulating the findings and conclusions. PRI staff members, C. Gordon Morris and Robert McDaniel, prepared the report.

Needs Assessment Study

In an effort to assist the Regional Coordinating Committee choose region-wide task force topics, the Needs Assessment Study Group was formed to "identify and assign priority to five or more rural issues common to the PRI geographic region for purposes of forming regional task forces as called for in the PRI plan of work." (Report, p.1) The forty-four page report, Priorities For Rural Improvement, was issued in July, 1981 and distributed initially to Regional Coordinating and sub-regional committee members.

Much of the data for the report came from a survey which sampled all citizens living in the fifteen county PRI region whose names were in the most recently published public telephone directories. Of the total population, 2000 households were surveyed. In addition, all officials of local governments were surveyed. Ralph Loomis and Michael Schwalbe, PRI staff members, coordinated the project.

PRI anticipates using the report not only for task force topic selection but for helping partner organizations do program planning. Considerable interest has been shown in the report by organizations with service missions in eastern Washington. Several follow-up studies will be conducted by PRI staff.

The last several pages have attempted to illustrate the nature of PRI's continuing commitment to the broad program goals that have guided activity in

the partnership since 1976. Next, a progress report will be given on the new dimensions added in PRI as a result of the grant extension.

III. PROGRESS REPORT--NEW DIMENSIONS

The extension of grant funding by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation made it possible during 1980-1981 for the Partnership for Rural Improvement to initiate or expand several program emphases. These emphases can be labeled: task forces, community service fellowships, community education, model diffusion, and internships. For the most part these emphases can be thought of as mechanisms to achieve some broader program purpose.

The grant renewal proposal identified several new opportunities available to PRI which have now become central to the PRI mission for the 1980-1983 period. One major program purpose is to develop institutional support mechanisms for PRI within partner organizations. Since the higher education institutions serve as the infrastructure for PRI, designing and fully funding units from which PRI activity can be conducted permanently is especially crucial. Other program thrusts include establishing a support base for the community service function; expanding the primary community service roles; broadening the organizational and programmatic focus; and transfer of the PRI model to other locations.

Experience was gained during the past year in implementing the mechansims listed above. The report will describe the major activities by each category, provide the preliminary evaluations of each effort, and identify any modifications that are anticipated for 1981-1982.

TASK FORCES

One of the primary purposes of PRI is to help build linkages between educational institutions as producers of knowledge, public agencies as translators and users, and rural citizens as beneficiaries of this knowledge. In addition

to increasing collaboration among faculty, public officials, citizens, and agency personnel, the task force program is designed to: (1) provide a mechanism and products which may be useful in solving quality of rural life issues with region-wide implications, (2) provide a mechanism for resource people (especially educators) to get involved in community service activity, (3) increase task force participants' understanding and use of problem-solving methods, and (4) increase public support of community service activity.

While most PRI projects are oriented to specific communities, the task force program offers potential for addressing problems of region-wide concern in the PRI region. At this level, the task force program operates like a microcosm of the PRI model. All the basic components of PRI designed to put users in touch with knowledge resources for purposes of problem-solving are present, but are operationally compressed into a time frame of four to six months, the present lifespan of each task force.

Expansion of the task force concept in PRI required development of a new program management strategy. A management team was formed to implement the task forces. This team consisted of a full-time PRI staff member, who doubled as project director for WSU's Title V project; a graduate student intern to share coordinating responsibilities; and a sub-committee of the Regional Coordinating Committee to monitor task force activity. Initiation of the program also required the establishment of several policy and procedural documents. These included conceptual papers on task forces, agreements on program objectives, and operational guidelines. Other materials which were developed dealt with strategies and criteria for identifying issues to be addressed by task forces, procedures for recruiting participants, and announcements of task force topics.

In order to get the task force program underway the Regional Coordinating Committee representatives reviewed a range of needs assessment data and selected as an initial task force topic rural transportation. However, it was felt that a more elaborate needs assessment would have to be undertaken to identify the issues of problems subsequent task forces would address. The project team thus formed a modified task force to identify priority rural improvement problems in the fifteen-county PRI region. By virtue of its lack of citizen participants, this modified task force was called a study group. The two projects are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Rural Transportation

Rural citizens commonly need to travel greater distances than urban residents to access services, consumer goods, and employment. Due to changes in the composition of rural populations, increasing costs of transportation, changes in employment patterns, and the continued limited accessibility of essential services in rural areas, it appears existing rural transportation systems may no longer be adequate to meet the needs of many rural citizens. In response to this there has been created a number of minor transportation systems for special client groups, of transportation-related laws, and of agency departments to administer these laws and programs. Despite the help these agencies, laws, and programs were intended to provide, rural citizens and public officials are often trapped in the middle of real social and political pressures to improve rural transportation services without the knowledge required to do so.

The task force on rural transportation formed by PRI is currently winding up its activity with a report expected in the near future. A dozen Washington citizens and public officials have joined together to develop a working manual to be used by local government officials to enhance their capabilities in addressing rural transportation problems and to deal with them more effectively. Three community service fellows are working as members of the task force.

Needs Assessment

If PRI was to invest substantial resources in topic-specific task forces some definitive work on the top priority issues had to be done. The need was for data which would enable the Regional Coordinating Committee to project task force topics a minimum of a year in advance. Advance notice was required to recruit task force members and community service fellows. The question was how best could PRI organize to get the information needed to select worthwhile topics in which there was reasonable faith.

A six person study group was assigned the task of reviewing needs assessment data and recommending priority issues to the Regional Coordinating Committee. The study group included a regional planner, a home economist, a political scientist, and sociologists. Four of the six members were given community service fellowships for the duration of the study. They came from three rural resource organizations. The study was published in July, 1981.

The study group reviewed prior needs studies and reports and consulted with knowledgeable individuals to form an initial list of pertinent issues and problems. Preliminary lists of issues and problem statements were re-

viewed by Regional Coordinating Committee members and other individuals--totalling 150 people. After further refinement of the statements, it was decided to implement a survey of the general population in the fifteen-county region, elected county and city public officials, and PRI staff and partner participants. The survey was undertaken to provide an additional source of data for recommending priority task force topics.

Questionnaires were sent by mail to 2000 households, 735 public officials and 100 PRI people on April 7, 1981. Two primary concerns emerged from the survey: The prevention and control of rural crime and the problem of sufficient money to provide needed local government services. PRI participants demonstrated a much stronger concern for the seriousness of the problem statements included in the survey and were more able to suggest task force topics.

Three recommendations have been made by the study group to the Regional Coordinating Committee: (1) that a task force be formed to investigate and suggest methods to help local government deal with declining revenues; (2) that a planning conference be held, and perhaps a subsequent task force, to investigate the extent and nature of rural crime in the PRI region; and (3) that each sub-regional committee select an issue of most relevance to its area and sponsor a task force.

Original plans for the task force program called for the initiation of two or three task forces per year, each operating four to six months. Experience to date with the program has suggested a need for greater flexibility in task force planning. Preliminary assessments point to the difficulty in managing effectively from one office the diverse requirements of recruitment, coordinating meetings and other logistics, providing subject matter guidance,

and administration. Further, the time frame of four to six months has proven to be far too brief a time.

Several modifications have been agreed to by the Regional Coordinating Committee to give the program greater flexibility. Proposals have been made, for example, to undertake task forces in rural development policy formation, growth impact mitigation, and rural leadership development; each would be slight departures from the initial region-wide problem-solving focus. To expand the task force program to incorporate these new directions requires greater flexibility in the duration of task forces, composition of membership, and functions.

The proposal to shift some of the task force activity to the sub-regional committees is intended to promote increased citizen participation in the program by focusing on issues and problems of more immediate geographical relevance. It also builds stronger ownership by the sub-regional committees. By modifying the program to allow multi-county task forces it is possible to abide by the orginal goal of developing a problem-solving mechanism which operates beyond the level of a specific community. Task force acitivites of this scope will also offer the potential for attracting broader participation in any dissemination efforts that result from the task forces.

COMMUNITY SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS

A major goal of the Partnership for Rural Improvement is to assist partner institutions and organizations in implementing and strengthening their outreach efforts to rural people. This public service mandate, while common to all partners, is influenced by a variety of traditions, legalistic directives, and organizational reward patterns. PRI initiated community service

fellowships to provide incentive to individuals and partner institutions and organizations to break free from obstacles to community service.

The fellowship program is designed to promote interdisciplinary activity and the interaction of agency personnel. The fellows work intensively as members of a specific task force to address priority rural improvement problems or issues. Several fellows, from different institutions and agencies, possessing disciplinary expertise appropriate to the task force issue, are assigned to each task force. This mechanism allows the opportunity for mutual learning between fellows, and between fellows and other task force participants. The fellowship program offers a unique opportunity for fellows to participate in a public service role and gain experience in applied rural problem-solving.

Community service fellowships provide part-time salary replacement and expenses and require administrative approval and endorsement. The fellowships vary in length, with most lasting up to six months.

During 1980-1981 a total of seven people received community service fellowships. The following list identifies the fellows by task force assignment and non-PRI affiliation:

Rural Transportation Task Force

- Jotin Khisty, Department of Civil Engineering, Washington State University, Pullman
- William Kelley, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Eastern Washington University, Cheney
- John Noffsker, Tri-County Economic Development District, Colville

Needs Assessment Study Group

- Don Dillman, Department of Rural Sociology, Washington State University, Pullman
- Mark Fredericksen, Whitman County Regional Planning Council, Colfax
- Geraldine Plater, Cooperative Extension, Washington State University, Wenatchee
- Bruce Throckmorton, Department of Sociology, Eastern Washington University, Cheney

The community service fellowship and task force programs are designed as complimentary efforts. Thus many of the difficulties associated with the management of task forces described in the prior section apply equally to the fellowship concept. To emphasize the major point, the fellowship program depends on adequate advance notice on the selection of task force topics in order to recruit and orient community service fellows. The basic problem during 1980-1981 has been the inability to gain the participation of interested fellows because of insufficient lead time for them to shift assignments. As PRI is able to schedule task forces much further in advance this problem should be corrected.

The second major difficulty noticed during 1980-1981 has been the lack of participation by community college personnel. Preliminary estimates attribute this not only to the causes identified in the preceding paragraph, but to the relevancy of the topic areas to a geographically focused institution. It is anticipated that with the creation of sub-regional task forces this problem will also be alleviated.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION

The Partnership for Rural Improvement has continued to search for com-

munity-based mechanisms that could foster collaboration among community agencies and residents in the solution of local problems. One mechanism with considerable potential is community education which stresses the cooperation of public schools with other educational and service agencies. PRI committed resources during 1980-1981 to design a model community education program in one target community to increase its capacity to solve problems and realize opportunities through a coordinated system of community education.

The Community Education Demonstration Site is located in the Central Sub-Regional counties of Grant and Adams. The Site is being developed within the framework of three broad goals: (1) demonstrate collaboration between a local school district community schools program, a community college, and other education and service organizations; (2) emphasize community development as a dimension of community education; and (3) assist other communities to establish and operate coordinated community education programs.

The Site was initiated during 1980-1981 in Moses Lake School District #161 with an effort to add community problem-solving as a component to its community schools program. PRI's Central Sub-Regional Committee hired a half-time program assistant with the title of Neighborhood Community Education Coordinator. The person's job has been to assist the coordinator of the Moses Lake Community Schools establish an exemplary neighborhood project. As a result, there was formed a pilot neighborhood community education council in the Knolls Vista-Longview area of Moses Lake. Personnel from the Moses Lake Community Schools, Big Bend Community College, Grant County Cooperative Extension, and PRI staff all collaborated to design and conduct the formative meetings.

Despite the difficulties of working with an entirely new group with a pro-

gram new to the neighborhood, several small scale successes have happened already for the citizens. Safety street signs have been placed in the area, individuals have begun to recognize the effectiveness of group action, and city officials have come to recognize the group as a legitimate voice for the neighborhood. Numerous examples have also been recorded of the increased capacity of individual participants.

Possibly because of the neophyte stage of the neighborhood council, its membership level and success to date are not all for which the partners might have hoped. Yet a select core of neighborhood people have developed a loyalty to the concept of community education and are working to develop their community. The Moses Lake Community Schools Coordinator is confident enough in the future of the effort that he is planning to establish a similar program in another neighborhood in the fall of 1981.

The real success of the Site to date is the fledgling collaborative program delivery mechanism between Moses Lake Community Schools and Big Bend Community College to assist other communities in the College's service district establish and operate coordinated community education programs. The mechanism has taken the form of a team made up of the College's Extended Class Coordinator, the Moses Lake Community Schools Coordinator, and the sub-regional Community Services Consultant. This team will work to expand community education programs in other locations. The recent award of a $12,000 grant from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction will assist this effort.

On-going documentation of the community education demonstration program is a central part of the project evaluation. PRI staff are collecting data on the roles of the primary actors, critical events, and perceptions of participants. An evaluation review is scheduled to visit the Site in the fall

to assess the extent to which the program is achieving the goals it has established.

MODEL DIFFUSION

The transfer of the PRI model to the four-county area of southeastern Washington was a major element in the 1980-1981 plan of work. The Partnership for Rural Improvement attempted to extend the key elements of its model to the counties of Asotin, Columbia, Garfield and Walla Walla which together comprise the service district of Walla Walla Community College. The purpose of this expansion was to test in another geographic setting the viability of the programming strategy used in the first years of PRI. The process was also intended to enable the program managers of PRI the opportunity to devise an appropriate diffusion strategy. Of course, the underlying concern of the move of PRI into the southeast was the same as in any other area served by PRI--improvement in the quality of rural life.

Formative evaluation was built into the diffusion strategy in order to enable PRI staff to assess the effectiveness of the processes used and to modify the strategy as necessary. The results of a preliminary evaluation by a PRI staff member employed part-time just for this assignment comprise the bulk of the report on this phase of the PRI program.

The design of the diffusion strategy was influenced by the work of Havelock and Lindquist as reported in the publication Increasing The Impact: Of Social Innovations Funded by Grantmaking Organizations (1980). Other influences were the experiences gained in forming three other sub-regional partnerships and the continuing refinement of PRI as a linkage model that occurred between 1976 and 1980.

Success of the model transfer depended initially on the willingness of

several key individuals and organizations to participate in the program. PRI followed the practice of having the community college serve as the sub-regional base that had proven beneficial in its other sub-regions. Placing the headquarters at the community college would strengthen the infrastructure of PRI which is based on administrative and management agreements between Washington State University and a host community college. Even before the final proposal for funds for the grant renewal were submitted to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, PRI staff had been assured of the support and cooperation of Walla Walla Community College officials.

Concurrently, PRI staff was gaining the support of Cooperative Extension administration and of personnel in Walla Walla County. PRI initiated a series of personal contacts with the objective of increasing the understanding and support for the proposed partnership. Following receipt of the grant on May 2, meetings were held to expand the number of participants involved in planning the partnership. These meetings culminated in an October workshop at which time the Southeast Washington Rural Partnership was formed. The sub-regional committee has been in operation since that time and has built a fine record of project activity.

Some of the more obvious successes have been the quick formation of the group; a fairly large and varied number of projects; high satisfaction from the users of PRI services who anticipate continued contact with the Community Service Consultant and the partnership; good working relationships with Cooperative Extension; and administrative support from Walla Walla Community College.

The newly created partnership has a decidedly task orientation. This

has served to focus attention on community projects. Relatively less time has been spent building ownership of the model's conceptual bases. In addition, one of the major goals of the diffusion strategy was to accelerate the time necessary to form a partnership. The Community Service Consultant was hired before the group was formed in October, although with the full involvement of community college and Cooperative Extension personnel. The evaluation suggests that there has been some negative results from this action.

Other highlights of the evaluation suggest the following weaknesses in the otherwise successful transfer of the model:

1. The sub-regional partnership does not fully understand the extent of the client group appreciation for the kind of capacity-building services received during the initial contacts with PRI.

2. The partners have largely accepted the Southeast Washington Rural Partnership as their own organization, but ownership of the PRI model has not been as readily acheived.

3. Accelerating the process of building understanding and ownership of the PRI model at the early stages of the transfer sacrificed the time necessary to extend the base of support to a broad range of participants.

4. Sufficient back-up support was not given to the Community Service Consultant by PRI program managers in order to enable her to fully understand and articulate the program's rationale and the relationship between the committee's interest and the diffusion strategy.

PRI staff and the Southeast Washington Rural Partnership are aware of these problems, openly and candidly discussing them at their recent meetings. This in itself demonstrates that the partnership has taken root, is healthy, and is determined to succeed as a part of the Partnership for Rural Improvement. Effective relationships are in place between Washington State University and Walla Walla Community College. The reorganization of the committee

in June, 1981, increased communication among the four primary entities: PRI staff at WSU, partners, the Community Service Consultant, and the users. All this should lead to the maturation of the PRI program in southeastern Washington.

INTERNSHIPS

Expansion of the internship program as originally envisioned in the grant renewal proposal was scaled down in 1980-1981 to match the resources made available for this effort. Two interns from Eastern Washington University assisted the Community Service Consultant in the Eas ern Sub-Region. One intern worked with the Task Force Coordinator and one with the Program Administrator in his assignment on reorganizing WSU outreach services. Without exception the interns were a valuable support to the staff members with whom they worked. It is anticipated that at least one additional intern will be employed during 1981-1982.

The five mechanisms discussed in this section of the report have served PRI well during 1980-1981 in its efforts to take advantage of the opportunities available to the program. PRI is on target with these methods in accomplishing the goals of strengthening its institutional development emphasis, expanding community service roles, broadening the organizational and programmatic focus, establishing a support base for community service, and developing a methodology of transferring the model to other geographic settings.

IV. PLANS FOR 1981-1982

The progress reported for the Partnership for Rural Improvement in 1980-1981 featured both continuing emphases from the first four years of the program and the new dimensions added for 1980-1983. PRI has attempted to balance the old and the new efforts. However, the past year was definitely a departure from the previous four. New management practices had to be put in place because of the transfer of the Program Administrator half-time to the Provost's Office. The staff shared many management tasks. New practices were also required because of the large-scale nature of the task force and fellowship programs. The adjustment to the added program elements proved difficult. In many respects PRI was understaffed for the variety of program responsibilities undertaken. Plans for 1981-1982 seek to accommodate the experiences learned in 1980-1981.

The report will highlight the objectives for 1981-1982 which apply to the program as a whole. It will not necessarily include the objectives approved by the Regional Coordinating Committee that were presented by the four sub-regional committees and Eastern Washington University. These objectives are available in the Program Administrator's office. The primary focus of this section of the report will be on the five categories central to the grant extension period: task forces, community service fellowships, community education demonstration program, diffusion of the model, and internships. A sixth category will feature general objectives of interest to program management.

TASK FORCES

The Partnership for Rural Improvement will continue to use task forces

as a method of organizing educators, public officials, and citizens into teams to address issues of concern to rural Washington. The focus of activity for this program area during 1981-1982 will be to:

1. Assist the state Planning and Community Affairs Agency to conduct a rural development policy planning effort resulting in recommendations to the Governor for legislative and executive action. PRI will manage the task force process and advise the agency on strategy.

2. Form a project team to provide counsel to communities impacted by the Creston and Mt. Tolman development projects. The Lincoln County Area Development task force will provide educational programs in cooperation with other assistance projects.

3. Conduct a conference on the problem of crime in rural eastern Washington. Form a task force based on the results of the conference should there be interest in doing so.

4. Disseminate the report of the Needs Assessment Study Group via planning conferences to each of the sub-regions, to partner agencies, and other public service groups in eastern Washington.

5. Conduct two or more sub-regional task forces on issues within the sub-regions. The needs assessment data will be used in task force topic selection.

6. Produce a slide-tape presentation that describes the task force concept, organization and operation of the task forces, and the results of the needs assessment study.

COMMUNITY SERVICE FELLOWSHIPS

There continues to be reason to expect that the community service fellowship program in the Partnership for Rural Improvement can be expanded into a major activity. Thus PRI is committed to awarding fellowships to encourage university, community college or other agency personnel to give intensive, short-term input into the task force projects. Special focus in this program area during 1981-1982 will be to:

1. Expand the number of community service fellowships to a minimum of twelve. Emphasize the recruitment of community college personnel especially on the sub-regional task forces.

2. Improve the project management system by clarifying fellow responsibilities and providing increased accountability for time and product.

3. Conduct a formative evaluation of the community service fellowship program prior to the close of the 1981-1982 fiscal year.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION

There is continued interest within the Partnership for Rural Improvement for developing a community-based mechanism to foster collaboration among community agencies and residents in the solution of local problems. PRI will refine the community education demonstration program as one means to achieve this goal. Specifically, the strategies for 1981-1982 will be to:

1. Explore the feasibility of a district-wide community development focus within the Moses Lake Community Schools in order to tackle significant community problems.

2. Expand the demonstration program to include the Odessa School District as a visitation site to show the applicability of a school-based rural improvement model.

3. Conduct a minimum of three community education/community skills workshops to increase the capacity of area residents to participate in community problem-solving.

4. Conduct an evaluation review of the demonstration program to assess the strengths and weaknesses of this PRI project.

MODEL DIFFUSION

The major effort in the diffusion of the PRI model will continue to be to support the development of the Southeast Washington Rural Partnership in the Walla Walla Community College District. The purpose of this effort continues to be to test the transferability of the model. In addition, PRI is

documenting the methodology of the diffusion process. Special attention in program direction in this area will be to:

1. Provide assistance to the Southeast Washington Rural Partnership in its efforts to form an effective sub-regional committee and program plan.

2. Support the Community Service Consultant with the transfer process by providing regular staff consultations.

3. Test the WETNET telecommunications system as a means of improving interorganizational coordination among the partner agencies in the four-county sub-region.

INTERNSHIPS

Limited resources are available to employ interns to assist with PRI's major emphases. The purpose of the internships is primarily to prepare a broader range of professionals who can contribute to rural improvement. PRI will attempt to provide learning experiences for university students during 1981-1982. The effort will be to:

1. Use two graduate students/interns to support the work of the task force participants and community service fellows.

2. Use a minimum of two graduate students/interns to assist PRI staff in their assignments.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT

There are a number of objectives for 1981-1982 that seem to be of a general nature which need to be included in the year's plans. In each case they give an indication of the effort of the Partnership for Rural Improvement to effectively carry out its contract with the Kellogg Foundation. The various strategies are to:

1. Develop a plan and begin implementation to expand the support base for community services with primary focus on the educational

partners and the state's education regulatory agencies.

2. Create an orientation package of audio-visual and print materials to introduce the Partnership for Rural Improvement to potential clients and funding sources.

3. Prepare a minimum of four case studies demonstrating the role and impact of PRI in order to better articulate the value of the program.

4. Document the interpretations and experiences of the community college-based staff to capture the project development techniques successful in establishing community projects.

5. Negotiate commitments for the continued funding of PRI for 1982-1983 with Big Bend Community College and Walla Walla Community College.

6. Continue consultations with administrators at Washington State University on the formation of a community service unit that institutionalizes PRI within the management structure of the University.

7. Recruit for an assistant director to provide management help to the program administrator.

V. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

The Partnership for Rural Improvement attempted several new program objectives during 1980-1981 which presented the Program Administrator with unpredicted experiences in budget management. However, the continued commitment of the partner organizations to the financial support of PRI was anticipated. Increased financial commitment by Eastern Washington University, Washington State Community College District 17, Washington State University, and Wenatchee Valley College highlighted the year. This report summarizes the noteworthy developments in PRI finances during the past year.

FINANCIAL REPORT, 1980-1981

Washington State University implemented fully the 4.0 fte commitment made in 1976 to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Salary and fringe benefits were paid for the program administrator position (Cooperative Extension and Central Administration), for the staff members from the College of Education (1.0), for one-half of a position in Sociology (Central Administration) and for one-half of a position in Cooperative Extension. In addition, another one fte was supported by Cooperative Extension through contracts with Washington State Community College District 17 and Wenatchee Valley College. Direct operational support totalled $20,000. Washington State University's College of Agriculture also assigned its Rural Development Act Title V Program to cooperation with PRI. Its resources exceeded $55,000. The total university support was calculated at $188,380 for 1980-1981.

Three other education institutions increased their direct fund commitments to PRI during the year. Eastern Washington University supported 1.5 of the 2.5 fte's designated as PRI positions. The amount of funds provided

exceeded $96,000 when combined with support for the Community Service Center. Wenatchee Valley College supported half of the community service consultant position at $12,000.00. Washington State Community College budgeted $14,500 to the support of the staff and operations. While both community colleges have made direct fund contributions in the past, 1980-1981 marked the first support of the consultant position. These contributions indicate a strong commitment to the goals of the partnership.

As with previous reports, a rough estimate of the contributed resources of partner organizations is the best that can be provided. Estimates for 1980-1981 total $750,000. This figure comes from assigning dollar calculations to direct salary and operational support ($300,000); office space, utilities and services ($250,000); faculty time devoted to PRI; donated travel expense, etc. ($200,000). Walla Walla Community College has joined Big Bend Community College, Eastern Washington University, Washington State Community College District 17, Washington State University, and Wenatchee Valley College in providing office space, accounting services, utilities and other services.

The major contractual service agreements of the past years were expanded by one during 1980-1981 to include Walla Walla Community College ($41,500). The other partners, with amounts received, were: Big Bend Community College ($48,000), Eastern Washington University ($25,000). Washington State Community College District 17 ($17,000), and Wenatchee Valley College ($17,000). As noted earlier in the report, Cooperative Extension via PRI also supplied $15,000 each to the latter two community colleges.

As was the case in the first year of grant support in 1976-1977, the Partnership for Rural Improvement has a very large underexpenditure of grant funds for 1980-1981. This is attributable primarily to the difficulty

in getting the task force and fellowship programs organized quickly and gaining access to faculty members once the programs were ready. This delay accounts for the bulk of the $95,948.63 balance in this line item. The balance of $20,436.93 in staff salaries remains because of the unsuccessful attempt to recruit an assistant director for PRI from within Washington State University in the early fall. When the recruiting effort was not satisfactory, PRI hired instead a part-time program associate.

The other major category in which there is a sizeable cash balance displayed is in Faculty Time, Partner Institutions. This category contains the sub-contracts with the five educational partners. The balance of $42,004.19 is fully encumbered by contracts for which final billing has not been received. There is likely to be some unexpended funds in the amount stated. A rough estimate is approximately $15,000. Travel expenses continued to be slightly higher than anticipated resulting in a $180.56 deficit.

BUDGET FOR 1981-1982

The proposed budget for W. K. Kellogg Foundation funds is outlined in Figure 1. The Annual Finance Report listed in Figure 2 shows the method of arriving at the proposed budget. The request for revision of the budget is listed in a later paragraph.

Commitments by several partners to fund PRI activity are not shown in this budget. Three contributions can be mentioned: Eastern Washington University has committed approximately $118,000 for 1981-1982; Washington State Community College District 17 has committed $15,800 and Wenatchee Valley College $11,000. Other partners continue to provide valuable indirect support.

REQUEST FOR REVISION

The Partnership for Rural Improvement requests the carry forward of funds not expended as of the close of the fiscal year. The request is that there be a straight transfer of funds within the following line items: Staff Salaries, Wages, Fringe Benefits of $20,436.93; Faculty Time, Partner Institutions of $42,004.10; Computer Services of $704.85; Equipment, Supplies of $3,580.19. The request also is for the carry forward of the $180.56 deficit in the Travel category.

The proposed budget for 1981-1982 also reflects a request for a special distribution of the funds remaining in the Fellowships, Internships, Consultants line item ($95,948.63) The request is to be able to carry forward to 1981-1982 in the same line item $52,000; to carry forward to 1982-1983 in the same line item $30,000; and to transfer $13,948.63 to the Faculty Time, Partner Institutions in 1981-1982. It is believed that this transfer will enable PRI to better use the money for task forces next year and 1982-1983 now that the needs assessment study is completed and several management problems have proposed solutions. The introduction of sub-regional task forces should enable the resources in this category to more accurately reflect the potential program costs. The transfer of $13,948.63 to Faculty Time, Partner Institutions would enable PRI to support the sub-regional committees and Eastern Washington University at the level requested in the 1981-1982 plans of work: Big Bend Community College ($44,500), Eastern Washington University ($26,000), Walla Walla Community College ($44,500), Washington State Community College District 17 ($21,000), and Wenatchee Valley College ($21,000).

The general design and program options reflected in the 1981-1982 budget were determined by the Regional Coordinating Committee at its meeting on June 10, 1981.

Figure 1

BUDGET REQUEST 1981-1982
KELLOGG FUNDS

STAFF SALARIES, WAGES, FRINGE BENEFITS	$ 84,916.93
FELLOWSHIPS, INTERNSHIPS, CONSULTANTS	170,000.00
FACULTY TIME, PARTNER INSTITUTIONS	200,952.82
PRINTING, MAILING	12,000.00
TRAVEL	11,819.44
COMPUTER SERVICES	2,704.85
EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES	6,080.19
	$488,474.23

FIGURE 2

US

ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT TO W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

Project No. UADU01E

EXPENSE STATEMENT FOR PERIOD ENDING June 30, 1981				NEXT YEAR'S BUDGET	
I Approved Budget (line items per commitment letter, proposal, or approved revision)	II Actual Cash Expenditures of WKKF Funds for Year	III Differences between I & II	IV Approved Budget for Next Year [2]	V Proposed Budget for Next Year (if different from IV)
Staff salaries, wages, fringe benefits	$ 66,415.93	$ 45,979.00	$ 20,436.93	$ 64,480	$ 84,916.93
Fellowships, internships, consultants	118,000.00	22,051.37	95,948.63 [1]	118,000	170,000.00
Faculty time, partner institutions	159,360.16	117,355.97	42,004.19	145,000	200,952.82
Printing, mailing	12,000.00	12,000.00	-0-	12,000	12,000.00
Travel	11,160.05	11,340.61	(180.56)	12,000	11,819.44
Computer services	1,000.00	295.15	704.85	2,000	2,704.85
Equipment, supplies	5,000.00	1,419.81	3,580.19	2,500	6,080.19
	$372,936.14	$210,441.91	$162,494.23	$355,980	$488,474.23

NOTE:
1) See narrative report for request to distribute this balance between 1981-1982 (52,000) and 1982-1983 (30,000) and to shift $13,948.63 to faculty time category in 1981-1982.
2) Permission was granted to shift $25,000 from staff salaries to faculty time to reflect employment source of field staff.

Request to carry forward to 1982-83	30,000.00
Proposed Budget for Next Year - WKKF	$ 488,474.23
Less Kellogg Cash Balance	162,494.23
Proposed WKKF Payment	$ 355,980.00

FUNDS AVAILABLE DURING PAST YEAR	
Prior Year's Cash Balance	$ 15,456.14
Kellogg Payment	357,480.00
Grantee Support	188,380.00
Other (specify)	
TOTAL	$ 561,316.14

NOTE:

Detailed explanations should be given for substantial deviations in actual and/or proposed expenditures from originally approved budget items.

The Foundation provides support on a cash receipts and disbursements basis. We consider pending obligations as unexpended, and therefore they should be included in the budget for the following year.

I hereby certify the above expense statement and resulting cash balance to be correct. I also certify that this organization continues to be classified as an organization described in Section 509(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Grantee: Washington State University

Linda Bayles for — Vincent Hutnak, Finance Officer/Sponsored Programs
Chief Financial Officer (signature) — Title

Richard D Hagood — Program Administrator
Project Director (signature) — Title

August 4, 1981
Date